

To: Pawloski, John (DNRE)[PAWLOSKIJ1@michigan.gov]
Cc: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]; Sue Erickson[ericksons@michigan.gov]; Muniz, Nuria[Muniz.Nuria@epa.gov]; Saldivia, Luis (DNRE)[saldivial@michigan.gov]; walczakj@michigan.gov[walczakj@michigan.gov]
From: [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
Sent: Tue 6/28/2016 12:21:47 PM
Subject: Oversight Group: Compilation of Questions/Concerns WWW Tannery Site
Redikse 2016 Pore Water Report.docx
Summary of Questions WWW Tannery oversight group.docx
Rogue River Temperature Report Final.pdf
DSC_0097.JPG
DSC_0101.JPG
DSC_0102.JPG
DSC_0103.JPG
DSC_0105.JPG
DSC_0112.JPG
DSC_0116.JPG
DSC_0122.JPG

Hi John,

On behalf of CCRR, WMEAC, and other members of our oversight group, we are submitting the following compilation of concerns regarding the dearth of progress at the Wolverine Tannery Site. It has been four years since the CERCLA report was completed and very little new information has been gained regarding the four source areas of concern noted in that report.

1. The Pit
2. The Waster water treatment plant
3. The east bank of the Rogue River adjacent to the site
4. The Ust Area

Now, after reading the most recent 2016 Rose&Westra Report, where WWW appears to be finding every which way to not deal with the very real problems associated with ammonia, we find it important to strongly weigh in.

Attached to this e-mail are the following:

1. Comments from Dr. Rick Rediske of the Annis Water Resources Institute and professor at Grand Valley State University, a man whose credentials could not be higher. These comments are all in relation to the most recent 2016 report. However, he has additional concerns, as we all do, regarding the adequacy of the on-going investigation and remediation of this sight.
2. WMEAC is concerned, as we all are, that new laws proposed in Part 201 legislation, will only make it easier and more convenient for WWW not to fulfill their obligations to the Clean Water Act or take action to deal with the ammonia problems that continue to erode the water quality of the Rogue River in the Impoundment area.
3. CCRR, as well as Dr. Rediske and WMEAC are concerned and mystified as to why a new portion of Rum Creek, since October of 2015, and on the the tannery site, has now been covered

over by a large cement slab. (see photos). When I spoke to you last fall about this, it did not seem that the DEQ was even aware that this work activity had taken place. Was this a permitted work activity, and if it was, on what basis was it approved as being a good thing for the health of Rum Creek?

4. The Oversight group would like to meet with the DEQ soon after your meeting with Wolverine on June 30, 2016. Sometime in early July we would like to discuss in further detail *all* our concerns related to the lack of any significant, targeted progress made in regards to the investigation of environmental problems still associated with this Site.

5. Last question: Has a conceptual site model ever been submitted to the DEQ?

Thank you for your time and your willingness to address these concerns.

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

r CCRR and all the members of the WWW Citizen Oversight Group.